

REMARKS

The present Amendment is in response to the Advisory Action issued by the Examiner on September 14, 2004, in the above application. As advised by the Examiner in that Office Action, claims 59 and 60 remain rejected. In the accompanying remarks, the Examiner indicates that there is not enough evidence in the existing literature to support Applicants' argument that the term "parabolic pulse" is a term of art. Accordingly, absent a definition of this term which refers to the temporal form of the pulse, the Examiner maintains his rejection over Fermann. Fermann illustrates a spectral plot which, to the Examiner's eye at least, has a parabolic form.

In order to eliminate this issue and place the application in condition for allowance, Applicants have amended claims 59 and 60 in order to specify that it is the "temporal form" of the pulses which is parabolic. As argued in the previous response, this was the intended meaning of the claims all along; accordingly, what was implicit in the claims is now simply explicit.

In an interview held on October 4, 2004, the Examiner agreed that this Amendment would distinguish claims 59 and 60 over the cited Fermann reference. Accordingly, it is believed that the claims now clearly stand in condition for allowance.

For the record, Applicants would like state that, in addition to the arguments already of record, it is apparent that the spectral plot illustrated in Fermann does not constitute a "pulse" as that word is commonly understood. Rather, Fermann's plot is simply a graphical representation of the spectral characteristics of the light he is measuring. In other words, it is basically a means of graphically depicting statistical information. This, Applicants submit, does not constitute a

“pulse” as that term would be understood by one of skill in the art, or even the pedestrian observer.

In any event, the Amendment submitted herewith should end the present rhetorical debate, and place the claims in condition for allowance. Entry of the Amendment is therefore respectfully solicited.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Richard C. Turner
Registration No. 29,710

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 5, 2004